IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

TESTAMENTARY AND INTESTATE JURISDICTION

MISCELLANEOUS PETITION NO.13 OF 2001

IN

MISCELLANEOUS PETITION NO.7 OF 1988

Appasaheb Gundappa Lale. ...Petitioner.

vs.

1. Smt.Rajashree w/o. Papa @Nemanna Lale
and others. ...Respondents.

Dr.K.N.Velankar, for Petitioner.

Mr.S.D.Dharmadhikari, for Respondents 3 & 4.

CORAM: D.K.DESHMUKH,J.

DATED: 7th July, 2006.

P.C.:-

The learned Counsel appearing for petitioner is not in a position to point out the provisions of law under which this Court can grant relief which are prayed for in the petition. When I put this question to the learned Counsel, she sought time and adjournment. The matter is on board. This is a basic question that arises and therefore, no adjournment can be granted. The petitioner has referred to several consent terms and the orders passed from time to time by

the Court at Sangali as also by this Court, but copies of all those consent terms and the orders passed from time to time have not been produced. In the absence of proper material produced by the petitioner, it is not possible even to comprehend what is the grievance made by the petitioner. It appears that the petitioner is not serious about prosecuting this petition. Taking overall view of the matter therefore, the petition cannot be entertained. It is disposed of.